

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/773,752Applicant(s)
Yamaguchi et alExaminer
Tae YoonArt Unit
1714

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Tae Yoon (3) _____(2) Mr. Ben Schroeder (4) _____Date of Interview Nov 5, 2002Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal (copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Claim(s) discussed: AllIdentification of prior art discussed:
Of the recordAgreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

There is no definition to the recited "substantially free of" in the spec. The examples do not show the use of any styrene, for example, and thus it is unclear as to the presence of the styrene which is the cause of the bad smell according to the teaching of the written description of the invention. The examiner does not know the amount related to said "substantially free of". Is it 3% or 20%, for example? The examiner believes that said styrene may be added to the composition to improve flow property or reduce the cost of the composition. Thus, applicant failed to define said "substantially free of". The phrase "consisting of" may have better argument for applicant over the prior art if applicant does not use styrene at all. The phrase "consisting essentially of" in the claim alone cannot overcome the rejection based on "comprising" absent any showing or unexpected result.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required